9

 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,252	12/22/2003	Yzhak Ronen	1209-33	4472

23869   7590   04/30/2007
HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 JERICHO TURNPIKE
SYOSSET, NY 11791

EXAMINER
WANG, HARRIS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2139	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/743,252	RONEN ET AL.
		Examiner	**Art Unit**	
		Harris C. Wang	2139	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>2/1/2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>01 February 2007</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-25 are pending

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive.

Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. A new rejection follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, claims "blocking access to the database for downloading the file." It is unclear whether the blocking starts once the file has been downloaded or after the time limit has elapsed.

Claims 2-15 are dependent on Claim 1 and are rejected for the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Baltes (US 2003/0103615).

Regarding Claims 1-3,

Baltes teaches a method for securely downloading files to a managed device, the

method comprising the steps of:

selecting a managed device for interfacing with networks or devices over the

Internet; ("To access the Internet, customer premises network equipment (CPNE) such as

broadband modems, routers, and modem-router combination products require being setup"

Paragraph [0002])

assigning a unique identification number to the device;

creating a file for the managed device on a database, wherein the file can be

downloaded over the Internet to the managed device; ("a method in which a central

server may be contacted when configuration information is needed for a broadband

communication device. This contact may be initiated via a dial-up modem." Abstract). The

Examiner interprets that the file has inherently been created.

creating an access verification program for downloading the file, wherein the

access verification program permits a user of the managed device at a remote location

to access the file over the Internet by entering the unique identification number, and

wherein the access verification program permits the user to download the file over the

Internet for a period of time; receiving an identification number by from the user;

verifying that the identification number received from the user is the same as the

unique identification number; *("The central server then determines who the customer is*

through an identification of the source of the communication...The central server is able to

access a number of databases that contain configuration information for the customer."

Paragraph [0019] lines 1-3, Paragraph [0020] lines 1-3)

permitting access to the database by the user for downloading the file for a

period of time; downloading the file from the database to the managed device;

and blocking access to the database for downloading the file. *("The central server*

downloads the configuration information from the database. Then, it transfers the configuration

information over the dialup communication link. Once the configuration information is at the

broadband communication device, the broadband communication device may use the

information to configure itself." Paragraph [0021])

The Examiner notes that all routers inherently are assigned identification

numbers/serial numbers. The Examiner also notes that access to the database for

downloading the file is inherently blocked eventually after the file has been

downloaded.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner interprets configuration information as

configuration file. Regarding Claim 3, a router is included in the list of devices.

Regarding Claim 4,

Baltes teaches the method for securely downloading files to a managed device

according to claim 1, wherein the unique identification number is the serial number of

the managed device. *("Furthermore, a broadband communication device serial number may*

be provided to the central server." Paragraph [0019])

Regarding Claim 14,

Baltes teaches the method of Claim 1, where the access to the database for

downloading the file is inherently blocked after the file has been downloaded. The

Examiner interprets blocking access to the database as terminating the link between

the database and the router.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
>
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
>
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
>
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
>
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Baltes in view of Bertino's paper "A Temporal Authorization Model" (1994).

Regarding Claims 6 and 15,

Baltes teaches the method for securely downloading files to a managed device

according to claim 1.

However Baltes does not teach that the period of time is predetermined.

Bertino teaches "a discretionary access control model in which authorizations

contain temporal information. This information can be used to specify temporal

intervals of validity for authorizations and temporal dependencies among authorizations

(Abstract)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the method of Baltes with the teachings of Bertino

The motivation to combine is that Bertino teaches a well known technique in

access control which teaches limiting authorization using temporal constraints.

Baltes and Bertino do not explicitly teach that downloading is the access mode,

or privilege, for which authorization is granted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to include downloading as a privilege in the Access Control model of Bertino.

The motivation is the right to download is a well-known right in Access Control

models.

Regarding Claim 7,

Baltes teaches the method for securely downloading files to a managed device

according to claim 1.

However Baltes does not teach that the period of time is less than 4 hours.

Bertino teaches "a discretionary access control model in which authorizations

contain temporal information. This information can be used to specify temporal

intervals of validity for authorizations and temporal dependencies among authorizations

(Abstract)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the method of Baltes with the teachings of Bertino

The motivation to combine is that Bertino teaches a well known technique in

access control which teaches limiting authorization using temporal constraints.

Baltes and Bertino do not explicitly teach that downloading is the access mode,

or privilege, for which authorization is granted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include downloading as a privilege in the Access Control model of Bertino.

The motivation is the right to download is a well-known right in Access Control models.

Baltes and Bertino also do not explicitly teach where the time limit is less than four hours.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to limit the time interval of Bertino to less than hour hours.

The motivation for the time period to be less than 4 hours is acclimate users requirement.

Regarding Claim 8,

Baltes teaches the method for securely downloading files to a managed device according to claim 1.

However Baltes does not teach that the period of time is less than 1 hour.

Bertino teaches "a discretionary access control model in which authorizations contain temporal information. This information can be used to specify temporal intervals of validity for authorizations and temporal dependencies among authorizations (Abstract)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the method of Baltes with the teachings of Bertino

The motivation to combine is that Bertino teaches a well known technique in

access control which teaches limiting authorization using temporal constraints.

Baltes and Bertino do not explicitly teach that downloading is the access mode,

or privilege, for which authorization is granted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to include downloading as a privilege in the Access Control model of Bertino.

The motivation is the right to download is a well-known right in Access Control

models.

Baltes and Bertino also do not explicitly teach where the time limit is less than

one hour.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to limit the time interval of Bertino to less than hour hours.

The motivation for the time period to be less than 1 hour is acclimate users

requirement.

Claims 5, 9-13, 16-17, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Baltes in view of Mehler (US 2002/0179709)

Regarding Claims 5, 9-13

Baltes teaches the method for securely downloading files to a managed device according to claim 1. Particularly Baltes teaches a "serial number may be provided to the central server" Paragraph [0019].

However Baltes does not teach further comprising selecting a portable device for reading the unique identification number, where the device may be a bar code scanner. Additionally Baltes does not teach a password being entered into the portable device. Finally Baltes does not teach the combination of the password and ID to be downloaded from the portable device to the database.

Mehler teaches a method of "(a) receiving at least one authorized user password associated with a transaction code; (b) receiving at least one single-use code carrier bearing a transaction code...printed thereon in an optically readable digital code (c) presenting the code carrier and the password for verification in order to receive authorization" (Paragraph [0028]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Baltes with the teachings of Mehler.

The motivation to combine is for "securely carrying out a...transaction. (Paragraph [0028])"

The Examiner interprets that the step of presenting the code carrier and the password for verification as downloading the ID number and password from the portable device to the database. The Examiner interprets that if a password is received it must inherently first been assigned.

Regarding Claims 16-17 and 21-24

Baltes teaches all the limitations of Claim 16 (See Regarding Claim 1) including the use of a serial number (See Regarding Claim 4), with the exception of assigning a unique password to the router, receiving a password from the user, and verifying the password received by the user. Baltes teaches all the limitations of Claim 21-23 except for the ID and password being read by a barcode scanner which is then downloaded to the router to the database.

Mehler teaches a method of "(a) receiving at least one authorized user password associated with a transaction code; (b) receiving at least one single-use code carrier bearing a transaction code...printed thereon in an optically readable digital code (c)

presenting the code carrier and the password for verification in order to receive

authorization...(d) receiving verification of a match between the transaction code and

the transaction account and verification of the password" (Paragraph [0028]). The

Examiner interprets that the password has inherently been assigned to the router.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the method of Baltes with the teachings of Mehler.

The motivation to add an additional password is for additional security. The motivation

to use a barcode scanner and download the ID and password to the database is to

provide a way to read provide verification.

Concerning Claim 24, the access to the database is inherently terminated after the file

is downloaded.

Claims 18-20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Baltes in view of Mehler as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of

Bertino.

Regarding Claims 18-20 and 25

All the limitations of Claim 18-20 and 25 are anticipated in the rejection of claim 16, except that the period of time is predetermined.

Bertino teaches "a discretionary access control model in which authorizations contain temporal information. This information can be used to specify temporal intervals of validity for authorizations and temporal dependencies among authorizations (Abstract)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Baltes with the teachings of Bertino

The motivation to combine is that Bertino teaches a well known technique in access control which teaches limiting authorization using temporal constraints.

Baltes and Bertino do not explicitly teach that downloading is the access mode, or privilege, for which authorization is granted.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include downloading as a privilege in the Access Control model of Bertino.

The motivation is the right to download is a well-known right in Access Control models.

It is inherent that downloading will be blocked if there is a time limit for downloading.

Conclusion

5.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Harris C. Wang whose telephone number is

5712701462. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5:30, Alternate Fridays

Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, AYAZ R. SHEIKH can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HCW